DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 268 097 SP 027 412

AUTHOR Gunter, Mary Nell
TITLE A Comparative Study of Participants and Nonparticipants in the Florida Beginning Teacher Program.
INSTITUTION Florida Educational Research and Development Council, Inc., Ft. Myers.
PUB DATE 85
NOTE 76p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teachers; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Program Effectiveness; *State Programs; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Behavior
IDENTIFIERS *Beginning Teacher Program (Florida)

ABSTRACT

A study compared two groups of inexperienced teachers, one of which participated in the Florida Beginning Teacher Progam, and one which did not participate, to see if differences existed between the two groups. Study subjects were 154 first year teachers. The teachers who participated in the Florida Beginning Teacher Program were required to successfully complete a year-long program consisting of analytical observations and feedback, support, and assistance provided by a team composed of the teacher's building level supervisor, a peer teacher, and another professional educator. Teachers who did not participate in this program completed a traditional first year of teaching with no identified support system or training. This book presents the results of a study designed to determine the differences between the two groups in terms of: (1) behavior; (2) attitude; (3) self confidence; (4) intent to remain in the profession; (5) reemployability; and (6) effective teaching behaviors as exhibited by a performance measurement system. (CB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED268097

FLORIDA EDUCATIONAL
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL

RESEARCH BULLETIN

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PARTICIPANTS AND NONPARTICIPANTS IN THE FLORIDA BEGINNING TEACHER PROGRAM

by
Mary Nell Gunter

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Council

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Volume 18 Winter, 1985 Number 3

SP 027 412

FLORIDA EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL, INC.

OFFICERS:

President, Don Stone
Treasurer, Rick Nations

BOARD OF DIRECTORS:

Lee Rowell, John Hilderbrand, Evelyn Lynn, Jackson McAfee, Phyllis NeSmith, Mary Giella, Terrance Horrigan, Fran Kochan, James Daniels, Glenda Hamby

ADVISORS TO THE BOARD:

Charles Hayes, Central Florida Community College
Charles Henderson, University of Florida
Cecil Carlton, State Department of Education
Sandra K. McDonald, University of North Florida
Jake Beard, Florida State University
Patricia Manning, University of Central Florida
Sharon Kossack, Florida International University
Hayman Kite, Florida Atlantic University
William Castine, Florida A & M
Sam Matthews, University of West Florida
John Follman, University of South Florida

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY:

Charlie T. Council, Florida Atlantic University and
Southwest Florida Teacher Educational Center

MEMBERS COUNTIES	SUPERINTENDENTS	COUNCIL MEMBERS
Alachua County	Dr. Douglas Magann	Dr. Douglas Magann
Charlotte County	Robert L. Bedford	John Weigman
Citrus County	Carl Austin	Enrico Pepe
Collier County	Dr. Thomas L. Richey	Donald Thomsen
DeSoto County	Larry Browning	Phyllis NeSmith
Dixie County	James E. Hurst	Lloyd Jones
Glades County	Linda Green Taylor	Linda Green Taylor
Hamilton County	Fred D. Greene	James Coe
Hardee County	Peggy E. Shackelford	John Maddox
Hendry County	Dr. William Burke	Ken Dooley
Hernando County	Dr. James K. Austin	Martin Youngmann
Highlands County	Ruth E. Handley	David W. Robinson, Jr.
Hillsborough County	Dr. Raymond Shelton	John Hilderbrand
Indian River County	Dr. James A. Burns	Jackson McAfee
Lee County	Dr. James E. Melvin	Donald Stone
Madison County	Randall M. Buchanan	Bill Roberts
Marion County	Ralph S. Archibald III	Lee Rowell
Martin County	V. James Navitsky	Terrance Horrigan
Nassau County	Craig Marsh	James T. Northey
Okeechobee County	Danny Mullins	Danny Mullins
Palm Beach County	Thomas Mills	James Daniels
Pasco County	Thomas E. Weightman	Mary Giella
Sarasota County	Dr. James Fox	Rick Nations
Suwanne County	Frank Strankunas	Marvin Jones
Taylor County	Glenda Hamby	Glenda Hamby
Union County	James Cason, III	Howard G. McNeill
Volusia County	James E. Surratt	Evelyn J. Lynn
Wakulla County	Roger Stokley	Fran Kochan

FLORIDA EDUCATIONAL
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL, INC.

RESEARCH BULLETIN

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PARTICIPANTS AND NONPARTICIPANTS IN THE FLORIDA BEGINNING TEACHER PROGRAM

by
Mary Nell Gunter

PUBLISHED BY
Florida Educational Research
and
Development Council, Inc.

Additional copies of this book may be obtained from:
FERDC
P.O. Box 506
Sanibel, Florida 33957

Individual Copies $3.00
Annual Subscription (4 Issues) $10.00
10% Discount on an order of 5 or more
Order of less than $20.00 must be accompanied by a check or money order.

F.E.R.D.C. NOTES ON THIS EDITION

The Florida Performance Measurement System is a research developmental effort to determine ways and means of improving the performance of beginning teachers in the state of Florida. Mary Nell Gunter participated in the Performance Measurement System Development in the early stages and is currently considered to be one of the most knowledgeable people in the state on the domain material, the formative and summative instruments and in training effective observers and evaluators of classroom teaching.

This bulletin is the first research to be done on the Beginning Teacher Program to our knowledge. We think this alone makes this bulletin important to all Florida districts, to colleges who are involved in teacher preparation and others interested in teacher preparation.

We are pleased to publish this bulletin and congratulate Mary Nell Gunter for contributing to a badly needed knowledge base on the Beginning Teacher Program in Florida.

Charlie T. Council
Executive Secretary

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION	11
Statement of the Problem	15
CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW	19
Induction Programs	19
Institutional Induction Programs	19
State-Wide Induction Programs	21
Problems of Beginning Teachers	24
Teacher Effectiveness	27
Research Characteristics in the Florida Beginning Teacher Program	29
CHAPTER III DESIGN OF THE STUDY	31
Definitions	31
Variables	33
Independent Variable	33
Dependent Variables	36
Research Questions	37
Validity	37
Validity of Treatment Implementation	38
Statistical Conclusion Validity	38
Instrumentation	38
Data Analysis	40
Limitations	40
CHAPTER IV ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS	41
Description of Research Participants	41
Research Question I	43
Research Question II	45
Research Question III	46
Research Question IV	48
Research Question V	50
Research Question VI	50
CHAPTER V, SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	53
Conclusions	54
Research Question I	54

Research II 55
Research Question III 56
Research Question IV 56
Research Question V 57
Research Question VI 57
Recommendations 58
LIST OF REFERENCES 73
REFERENCE NOTES 80
APPENDIX I 65
Composition, Criteria and Selection Process for Support Staff 65
APPENDIX 2
Summative Observation Instrument 68
APPENDIX 3
Florida Generic Teacher Competencies 69
APPENDIX 4
Verification, Reconsideration and Appeal 71
APPENDIX 5
Group Comparisons of Demographic Data 72

LIST OF TABLES

NUMBER		PAGE
1	Days Absent	
2	General Satisfaction Scores on the MSQ	
3	Ratings of Self-Confidence in Performing Generic Competencies	
4	Frequencies of Statements of Intention	63
5	Frequencies of Principals' Recommendation Concerning Reemployment	
6	Teaching Behavior Observed on the *Summative Observation Instrument*	

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The Florida Beginning Teacher Program was developed as a component of a broad legislative thrust toward improving the quality of education in Florida. The 1978 and 1979 legislative sessions addressed early participation in the classroom for teacher candidates through SB 549 (Florida Statute 231.17) which stated that policies to provide for such early participation programs would be desirable. This act further provided for the establishment of a year-long post graduate internship program or one year of successful teaching experience as a prerequisite for initial teaching certification.

The 1979 Legislature passed HB 1689 (Florida Statute 231.17) which provided that "beginning July 1, 1981, no individual shall be issued a regular certificate until he has completed 3 years of satisfactory teaching pursuant to law and other such criteria as the state board shall require by rule, or a year-long internship approved by the state board. The department, in conjunction with teacher education centers and colleges of education shall provide for model satisfactory teaching and internship programs to be implemented in selected districts."

Implementation of this law as it related to the year-long internship was postponed until July 1, 1982, for the purpose of review and evaluation of six model internship programs which were piloted and for the purpose of developing administrative rules that would guide and define the development of district internship programs. In order to facilitate this postponement, the 1981 Legislature enacted SB 338 (Florida Statute 231.17, as amended) which said that one requirement of initial certification would be the successful completion of a year-long "beginning teacher program." Three years of satisfactory out-of-state experience were allowed as a substitution for participation in the Beginning Teacher Program, provided such experience was continuous within a ten-year period.

This law was further amended by the 1983 Legislature through deletion of the exemption for out-of-state experience. This amendment required all teachers, regardless of experience, who applied for initial Florida teaching certification July 1, 1983, and

thereafter, to successfully complete the Beginning Teacher Program as a prerequisite for regular certification (Florida Statute 231.17, as amended).*

*NOTE: *The 1984 Legislature further amended 231.17 to permit initial certification applicants with at least one full year experience to demonstrate the Florida Generic Teaching Competencies within an abbreviated program of 90 days.*

The Florida Beginning Teacher Program was based on the beliefs held by people engaged in pre-service and inservice teacher education. **The Summary Report** (1982) lists these beliefs as the rational for the Florida Beginning Teacher Program as follows:

1. Demands placed on teachers are greater than ever before due to the increasing complexity of our society and the expectations placed upon the school. The profession itself is more complex than it was 30 years ago; to teach well requires a highly skilled and competent professional.
2. There is an expanded knowledge base for teacher education, attributable to the large amount of research on teaching that has taken place over the last ten years. Teachers are expected to use this professional knowledge and to employ professional skills in their practice.
3. Current programs for the preparation of teachers are inadequate to meet the demands of professional practice. Evidence reveals that almost no major changes have occurred in the time allocated or content provided for pre-service teacher education in the last 30 years, despite significant advance in knowledge and fundamental changes in educational structures and practices in schools and other social agencies.
4. The public recognizes that teachers play a central role in providing educational opportunity. The public holds high expectations for teachers, as indicated by legislative action on mainstreaming, bilingual education, accountability, competency testing, and designation of funds for inservice education. The quality of teachers and teacher education is a national issue.
5. It is recognized that a fully developed professional program that

could prepare highly skilled teachers requires more than the traditional four years now allocated for teacher preparation. At the same time, extending the time required is believed by most college personnel to be not politically or economically feasible at this time.

6. Induction into the teaching profession, like any other profession, is a unique period. It is most likely the most difficult phase of a teacher career. All beginners have some problems; preservice programs have been unable to eliminate these problems.
7. A major reason for attrition from the profession is the lack of a formalized system for support during the induction period. Induction becomes a matter of survival.
8. The responsibility for quality control rests with the profession; it is not the sole responsibility of the pre-service program. Some of the most important things about teaching can only be learned in the school setting. (*Summary Report*, 1982, p.3)

In the November, 1981, meeting of the State Board of Education, Rule 6A-5, 75 was adopted which specifically addressed the approval requirements for a district Beginning Teacher Program. Included in the rule were the definitions for programs, procedures, criteria for successful completion, and appeal procedures. The rule emphasized the verification of the Florida Generic Teaching Competencies through a system of formative and summative evaluation. This requirement pointed out the need for the development of Standardized procedures for systematic performance observation and evaluation to enhance consistency from district to district, school to school and teacher to teacher.

As a result of this concern, a body of educators including district personnel, university faculties, and Department of Education staff met in Tampa, Florida, in November, 1981, and formed a Coalition who agreed to participate in and contribute to the development of a system to measure beginning teacher performance. The development of this system presented an opportunity to develop a framework for teacher behaviors which were based in research.

The Coalition members also agreed to fund the development of such a system through existing resources, including voluntary work. It also

agreed that such a system be based on knowledge accumulated from research on effective teaching. The following tasks were completed by the Coalition:

1. The research was assembled and categorized into six domains of teacher behavior:
   1.0 **Planning** — This refers to teacher performance in daily, weekly, and long range program planning in the preactive phase of teaching.
   2.0 **Management of Student Conduct** — This includes teacher activities that minimize the frequency of disruptive student conduct.
   3.0 **Instructional Organization and Development** — This refers to teacher performance that provides for conservation of class time, organization and delivery of instruction, and teacher-student interaction.
   4.0 **Presentation of Subject Matter** — This refers to manipulation of the content of instruction to induce learning.
   5.0 **Communication: Verbal and Nonverbal** — Teacher behavior that evokes or expresses affective personal states or communicates cognitive information.
   6.0 **Testing: Student Preparation, Administration, Feedback** — This refers to the ways teachers handle such matters as examination, tests and written work.
2. The collected research findings were cross-referenced with the Florida Generic Teaching Competencies.
3. Formative and summative observation instruments were developed to measure teacher performance.
4. Training for the knowledge and use of the Florida Performance Measurement System was developed.

What has been termed the Florida Performance Measurement System became the heart of the Beginning Teacher Program, enfolded within the idea of support and training offered by members of a Beginning Teacher Support Team.

State Board Rule 6-A5.75 also provided design criteria for district programs, including designation of the support team, the portfolio requirement, the professional development plan requirement, and district inservice training (see Appendix 1 for criteria). Criteria were also specified for formative and summative evaluation of participants, for which the FPMS was developed. A state-wide comprehensive training program for using the FPMS was developed and implemented in all three districts selected for this study.

Statement of the Problem

Approximately 1,000 beginning teachers participated in the Beginning Teacher Program in Florida in 1982-83. An equivalent number of beginning teachers were exempt from participation in the program by virtue of the fact that they applied for initial certification prior to the July 1, 1982, beginning date of the program. This naturally occurring situation presented a one-time opportunity to compare those two groups of beginning teachers, to hypothesize about differences that might have existed between them, and to collect information to test those hypotheses.

This study considered the following research questions which might be answered by studying these two groups of teachers:

I. Were there behavioral differences between the two groups as measured by their absentee rates?

II. Were there attitudinal differences between the two groups as measured by their scores on a job satisfaction inventory?

III. Were there differences between the two groups in their self-confidence in performing the Generic Teaching competencies?

IV. Were there differences between the two groups in their intent to remain in the profession?

V. Were there differences between the two groups in reemployability as measured by the principals' recommendation for employment?

VI. Were there differences between the two groups in the numbers of effective teaching behaviors exhibited on the *Summative Observation Instrument* of the Florida Performance Measurement System?

Lee, Hillsborough, and Marion counties agreed to participate in the study, which involved 77 teachers who were participants in the Beginning Teacher Program and 77 teachers who were exempt due to the fact that they applied prior to the July 1, 1982, beginning date. The following hypotheses were generated to serve as a guide for investigating the questions posed in the study:

1. There is no difference between participants in the Beginning Teacher Program and nonparticipants in their absentee rate.
2. There is no difference between participants in the Beginning Teacher Program and nonparticipants in their scores on a job satisfaction inventory.
3. There is no difference between participants in the Beginning Teacher Program and nonparticipants in their self-ratings of confidence in performing the Generic Competencies.
4. There is no difference between participants in the Beginning Teacher Program and nonparticipants in their intent to continue in the teaching profession.
5. There is no difference between participants in the Beginning Teacher Program and nonparticipants in their ratings for continued employment.
6. There is no difference between participants in the Beginning Teacher Program and nonparticipants in the numbers of effective teaching behaviors demonstrated.

The purpose of this study was to compare such data as described to determine any possible effects participation or non-participation in such a program might have had on the subjects. This study was a component of the Beginning Teacher Program evaluation plan, and the information gathered in this study may be considered a preliminary investigation of the effectiveness of the Florida Beginning Teacher Program in its first year of implementation. The data also serve as baseline information for studies of a longitudinal nature in

which researchers may choose to follow one or both groups of these first-year teachers to determine possible long-term effects of participation or nonparticipation.

The districts selected for participation in the study were identified by the Department of Education as being representative of large, medium, and small Florida school Districts. Marion County has characteristics of a small, rural district. Hillsborough County is considered a large, urban district, and Lee County is considered a medium, urban district. Within the three districts, all beginning teachers were identified as either participating or non-participating. Descriptive information including age, sex, race, grade level, subject area, degree level, and in-state or out-of-state university affiliation were gathered for each potential subject. Subjects were excluded from the study who had one or more years of experience. Participants and non-participants were matched and paired using the above variables. Tests of statistical significance which were used included t-tests for non-independent pairs and the Sign Test.

CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

This study includes a review of literature on induction programs, problems of first-year teachers and possible solutions through induction programs, and the research base of teacher effectiveness upon which the Florida Performance Measurement System is based.

Induction Programs

Concern for the preparation of teachers is reflected in the literature as, for example, when Conant (1963) in his analysis of teacher preparation programs in 35 colleges and universities commented on the minimal amount of practice teaching time provided in the programs studied. Conant also expressed concern for the impracticality of university teacher trainers providing assistance to first-year teachers, largely due to geographic distances between universities and school sites.

The practical experience issue of teacher preparation was further emphasized in studies of teacher induction by Hunt (1968) and DiTosto (1974). A major point made in these two studies was that beginning teachers with no on-the-job training were saddled with the same responsibilities and the same complex tasks as experienced teachers. The traditional preservice internship was described by Ryan in his book, *Don't Smile Until Christmas* (1970), as being unable to provide for opportunities to make personal and professional decisions.

Two major types of induction programs are found in the literature:

1. Institutional Programs — Induction programs associated with colleges or universities which may be degree related.
2. State-Wide Programs — Non-degree programs, Beginning Teacher Programs, which may end in certification.

Institutional Induction Programs.

A review of literature prior to 1979 related to induction programs with characteristics similar to Florida Beginning Teacher Program, both

descriptive and empirical, reveals, for the most part, fifth year programs associated with institutions of higher learning. The following programs are examples of this type of induction program (McDonald & Elias, 1980):

1. The Stanford Intern Program is a relatively small one-year program for college graduates who may or may not have had a background in education. They are not certificated teachers. Stanford interns are employed half-time as high school teachers of English, social studies, physical education and music in both urban and suburban schools.
2. The University of Oregon Resident Teacher Masters Degree Program is a one-year program for certificated elementary school teachers. The teachers are employed full-time in urban, suburban, and rural schools.
3. The Temple University Intern Teaching Program for College Graduates is a two-year program for college graduates with little or no background in education, but with a strong background in a content area for which teachers are needed, i.e., science and mathematics. Temple interns teach full time in inner-city and suburban schools.

When the teacher shortage from 1952 to 1954 captured the interest of the Ford Foundation (Woodring, 1957), a number of projects were funded which included expanded programs of graduate study intended to augment undergraduate programs of certified teachers. Similar programs were offered to graduates who did not have a background in education for the purpose of attracting them into the teaching profession. All Ford funded programs were associated with universities (McDonald & Elias, 1980).

The Teacher Corps Project also produced induction programs for uncertified graduates as well as certified beginners (Prince, 1976). An impetus for induction programs in the Teacher Corps was given by concern for both teacher shortages as well as overabundance. In the case of teacher shortages, the program was intended to attract candidates and train them in education, and, in the case of overabundance, programs were provided to improve quality through

setting criteria for professional growth and through providing assistance (McDonald and Elias, 1980). Klingele and Borland (1972) indicated that a requirement to extend clinical experiences of teacher candidates would both affect the teacher surplus as well as improve the quality of teacher education.

An example of an induction program resulting from such pragmatic pressures was the cooperative effort of Colorado State College and the Greeley School District (Moss, 1967). Teachers identified as outstanding in the Greeley district were offered the role of Master Teacher for which they received a $700 supplement and an appointment with the college. In addition, two interns, beginning teachers, were assigned to a Master Teacher in half-day assignments. These interns received credit hours and a $500 supplement from the college. The class load of a Master Teacher was increased by ten students in these situations. This program assigned the beginning teacher a status of graduate student receiving classroom experience and enabled the district to address the problems of class loads and teacher salaries. Moss (1967) commented that the program was a valid way to assist beginners although it was designed to deal with practical issues facing the college and the Greeley School District.

The University of Oregon induction program benefited certified elementary teachers who held full-time teaching positions (Kehl, 1977). This fifth-year program culminated in a Masters Degree for participants. The program was supervised jointly by the participating school district and the College of Education. In this program, intern-teachers attended weekly seminars, applied learning theories in the classroom and were given analytic feedback through supervision.

State-Wide Induction Programs

California was the first state to take action in developing a state-wide beginning teacher program. In the mid-seventies, the California Board of Education commissioned an investigative study, the *Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study*, which originally began as a certification program (McDonald & Elias, 1976). While the original focus of the study was to produce information concerning competencies important for beginning teachers, this purpose was abandoned, and efforts were directed toward studying second and fifth grade teachers

identified by their residual gains on achievement test scores in order to gather information regarding successful classroom practices.

Theodore E. Andrews (1983) in a synthesis of beginning teacher programs in the United States reported there were five states, including Florida, which had state-wide beginning teacher programs. All of these programs were established in the last five years beginning with the implementation of the Georgia program in 1980. In addition, Virginia is in the developmental state of implementing a Beginning Teacher Assistance Program.

The Georgia program, originating under the leadership of State Superintendent of Schools Charles Nis, focuses on the assessment of teacher performance using the Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument (TAPI). This instrument contains 14 competencies and 45 indicators which must be demonstrated within a three-year period. These observations are made by three persons: an external data collector, who is a state employee, an administrator, and a teacher. Observations are made twice by each member of the team. Scores have been attached to indicators, and acceptable levels for the competencies have been developed for the assessment instrument. The competencies and acceptable levels were derived through the process of professional consensus (Ellett, Capie & Johnson, 1980). Andrews (1983) lists the estimate given by Georgia for operating the program as $500,000, development costs, with $3,500,000 required for annual operational expenses. The Georgia program ends in certification.

The South Carolina Legislature established a Beginning Teacher Program which became operational in 1983-84. The program, which began with the passage of the Educational Improvement Act of 1979, was field-tested in 1982-83 and is not related to certification, but to employment decisions. After receiving a probationary contract, a beginning teacher in the South Carolina program is assessed by the school district using the state-developed *Assessment of Performance in Teaching Observation Instrument*. The performance instrument was developed by a task force using the Georgia instrument as a basis. Levels of performance were established using a process of observing and recording the performance of experienced teachers. All assessment is completed by the local district during a two-year

probationary period. Observation teams include an experienced teacher, a principal, and a district person. In 1982-83, $600,000 was funded for the program (Andrews, 1983).

The third state whose policies and assessment instruments are interrelated with the work in Georgia is Arizona. The Arizona Beginning Teacher Program, established through legislation, is currently being field-tested. The major difference in the Arizona program is the use of four observers, one of whom must be a teacher educator (Hunter, Note 1).

The Oklahoma Entry Year Assistance Program, a legislated program, is based on the assessment of teacher performance by a three-member team using an instrument developed by the state for that purpose. The team consists of a teacher-consultant, an administrator, and a teacher educator. An important aspect of the Oklahoma program is the role of the teacher-consultant who is responsible for providing seventy-two hours of consultation to the beginning teacher. The teacher-consultant is paid a stipend of $500. The observation team observes the beginning teacher three times, giving a total of nine observations. The decision whether or not to recommend the teacher for certification is made by a majority vote following the final observation (Andrews, 1983).

Virginia is in the beginning stages of implementing a legislated Beginning Teacher Assistance Program. The Virginia program will give graduates from Virginia teacher training institutions two years to qualify for continuing certification. Competencies will be demonstrated through a state-wide standardized assessment procedure. In addition, beginning teachers will be counseled on the acceptable levels of performance. Approximately $500,000 was awarded to Virginia universities to develop a research-based performance assessment system (Vance, Note 2).

The Florida Beginning Teacher Program, established through legislation, became effective July, 1982. Successful completion of the year-long program is a prerequisite to initial certification. The program is district based, using a team of observers including a peer teacher, the principal, and another educator. This team completes formative and summative observations of the teacher. The Florida

Performance Measurement System is used for this purpose by 66 of 67 counties; the remaining county uses other Department of Education approved performance measurement systems. The performance statements from the Florida Performance Measurement System were extracted from either process-product or experimental research studies.

In the Florida program, the observation team also serves as a support team for the beginning teacher. In addition to the observations, a portfolio is maintained with examples of the beginning teacher's work. Certification of successful or unsuccessful participants is recommended by the district superintendent, based upon the principal's recommendation and a review of the candidate's portfolio (State Board of Education Rule 6A-5.75, 1982).

The Florida Beginning Teacher Program was funded for $200,000 by the legislature over a two-year period for developmental and training purposes. The program is operationally funded through state staff development funds, approximately $2,720,000 for 1983-84

Other states such as Washington, Virginia, Hawaii, Illinois, and Maryland have taken limited action to investigate the possibility of implementing a beginning teacher program (Zeichner, 1979). This limited action has usually taken the form of identifying inservice training for first-year teachers, as in the case of the Wilmette, Illinois, program which held Saturday workshops and used helping teachers (McDonald and Elias, 1980). The Hite, et al., (1966) study for Washington State, tested the effects of reduced work loads and intensive inservice training on beginning teachers.

Problems of Beginning Teachers

There is considerable literature which specifically advocates induction programs as a solution to many of the problems of the new teacher. McDonald and Elias (1980) address these problems in a framework that they call phases. These phases are referred to as "The First Day of Teaching," (p. 178). "The First Weeks of School," (p. 208), and "The First Experience in Evaluating Pupils," (p. 212). McDonald and Elias further state that problems in these phases are

characterized by anxiety concerning how the new teachers will cope with instruction and anxiety concerning how they will react to their pupils and how their pupils will react to them. They characterized such problems as being basic rather than sophisticated or technical and refer to the first year as a survival period. Whatever habits are acquired during this period are likely to persist throughout their career according to McDonald and Elias.

Gaede (1978) concluded that new teachers doubt their competency both professionally and personally during the induction period. His study concentrated on the self-assessment of knowledge skills of 272 teachers at all levels, using the *Professional Readiness Inventory*. His findings revealed that beginning teachers scored lower on every scale including basic methods, administration of public schools, educational theory and history, methods for slow learners, use of media, and observing models.

Ryan (1979) calls the first-year experience the "rites of passage, which are tests of their strength and endurance." He emphasizes problems associated with the transition from theory into practice or reality, explaining that the initial year is fraught with specific problems for which the general training received in the university is not adequate. Wey (1951) surveyed new teachers and listed five problems as paramount to first year teachers: discipline, resources, assignment, pupil ability, need, interest, and motivation.

Dropkin and Taylor (1963) identified six areas of frequent problems for new teachers surveyed including discipline, relations with parents, evaluating teaching, planning, materials and class routines. Coates and Thoressen (1978) listed these self-reported concerns of first year teachers: discipline, being liked by students, knowledge of content, making mistakes, materials, socialization into school context.

Paul Burden (1979) studies fifteen teachers using structured interviews to elicit perspectives of the characteristics and influences on their professional development. His study included first-year teachers; second, third, and fourth year teachers; and fifth-year and later teachers. Analysis of these interviews revealed the following categories of professional characteristics:

Knowledge of Teaching Activities

Knowledge of Teaching Environment

Changing Images of Teaching

Professional Insight and Perception

Approach to Curriculum and Instruction

Professional Confidence, Security, Maturity

Willingness to Try New Teaching Methods (Burden, 1979, p. 174)

The first-year teachers in the study perceived that they had limited knowledge of teaching activities and environment. They reported conforming to preconceived images of teaching, with limited insight and perceptions of professionalism. Their approach to curriculum and instruction was subject-centered, and they reported an unwillingness to try new methods. They reported uncertainty and confusion in relation to professional confidence and maturity.

In contrast, the more experienced teachers reported an increasing command of knowledge of teaching activities and knowledge of environment. They indicated an increase in perception and insight, abandoning preconceived images about teaching. Experienced teachers reported being child-centered, continually trying new teaching methods, and perceived themselves as confident and secure.

Many authors have related the advantages to first-year teachers of an induction program as a solution to some of these problems. Such advantages are summarized below:

1. Emotional support (Gaede, 1978)
2. Supervised practice (Moss, 1967; Shimer, 1973)
3. Application of theory in classroom (Blackmore, 1968; Ryerson, 1967)
4. Helping teachers (Rivlin, 1966; Hamachek, 1969; Swanson, 1968)
5. Materials and resources (Cuban, 1964)
6. Community understandings (Carlson, 1970)

7. Skill in subject presentation (Rivlin, 1966)
8. Flexibility and style (Denemark, 1967)
9. Clinical supervision (McIntosh, 1971; Gatewood & Mills, 1975)

Teacher Effectiveness

Emphasis on designing teacher induction programs which use current research on teaching has been suggested by several teacher educators (Good, 1980; Fenstermacher, 1980; Smith, 1980). McDonald and Elias (1980) indicated that sometimes problems of beginning teachers were used to promote a new cause. They suggest that out of such studies as the *Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study*, recommendations be made that will change or modify existing programs and build a consistent theory as a basis for such programs. Most if not all of the induction programs reviewed were based on either generic teacher competencies which were derived through professional consensus or on textbook theories. While the *Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study* was not an induction program in any sense, it was an attempt to develop a research base upon which subsequent induction programs could be based. This study is one facet of a body of knowledge concerning teacher effectiveness which has risen in scope during the last two decades.

The term, teacher effectiveness, as addressed by researchers refers to the relationship between certain characteristics and behaviors of teachers and their effects on student achievement. Research on teacher effectiveness has as its goal the discovery of law or law-like statements about the relationship between teacher behavior and student achievement with potential for subsequent generalizations. Emphasis is placed on observable teacher behaviors categorized into variables and clusters of variables, a few of which are the focal point of any given study. As in all research, the quality of the study is related to the ability to replicate the findings in subsequent studies (Clark, 1979). Student scores on pre and post-tests are largely based on standardized tests such as the Metropolitan Achievement Test, (Brophy & Evertson, 1974), the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, (Soar, 1973), Wide Range Achievement Test, (Stallings & Kaskowitz, 1975), and the California Achievement Test (Emmer, Evertson & Anderson, 1980). A regression analysis involving a procedure for predicting

growth due to influences other than the teacher is usually employed in these studies, thereby relating expected growth to actual growth. Correlations can then be made between teacher variables and student achievement (McDonald & Elias, 1976).

Barak Rosenshine reports that between 1972 and 1976, six major correlational studies were conducted: Brophy and Evertson, 1974; Soar, 1973; Stallings and Kaskowitz, 1974; McDonald, et al., 1975; Tikunoff, Berliner and Rist, 1975; and Good and Grouws, 1976. In addition, there were three major experimental studies in this time frame: Ward and Tikunoff, 1975; Gall, et al., 1975; and Stanford Program on Teacher Effectiveness, 1976 (Rosenshine, 1976).

Gary Broich (1977) cites the lack of a framework or guide for selecting variables to be systematically measured. He states that promising process-product relationships encourage researchers to collect additional data, but that a framework needed to be developed for using such findings in assessing teacher performance.

The Florida Coalition for the Development of the Florida Performance Measurement System listed the following reasons for using the teacher effectiveness research as a basis for developing a performance assessment system:

1. The knowledge and skills derived from research literature, as the knowledge base for evaluating teachers, is easier to defend if contested.
2. The research studies indicate precisely what teacher behaviors are positively associated with either student achievement or student conduct or both.
3. The research literature enables us to cite specific evidence in support of particular teacher performance.
4. The language of research studies is precise and thus allows little chance for misinterpretation.
5. The research findings relevant to teacher effectiveness provide grounds for examination of the Florida competencies (Florida Coalition, 1983, pp. 1-2).

The *Final Report* of the Coalition (1983) describes the content of observation instruments which were developed based on the teacher effectiveness research.

> The content of these instruments is limited to the findings of experimental and process-product research on teacher effectiveness. All items are indicators of teacher behavior. Each of the items has consequential implications. An example of these implications, expressed in terms of a statement of principle, is: "If a teacher explicates and monitors rules then disruptive behavior will decrease, on-task time will increase and achievement will increase." This example provides the basis for hypotheses that can be examined in future studies of predictive validity. (Florida Coalition, 1983, p.9).

In addition, the Coalition (1984) developed documentation of the Florida Performance Measurement System in a volume entitled: Domains: *Knowledge Base of the Florida Performance Measurement System*. This research volume documents one hundred and twenty-one specific teacher behaviors that have been shown through research to be related to increased achievement and improved student conduct. The behaviors are categorized into six domains and provide a knowledge-base for the Florida Performance Measurement System.

Research Characteristics In The Florida Beginning Teacher Program

The Florida Beginning Teacher Program has components which the literature has pointed out as beneficial to new teachers. It is a program which offers support and assistance through the assignment of a peer teacher, a building administrator, and another professional educator. It is based on a system of analytical observation, appraisal and feedback concerning teacher behaviors identified in the Florida Performance Measurement System which was developed from research on effective teaching. The Florida Performance Measurement System supplies behavioral indicators for the Florida Generic Teaching Competencies which the beginning teacher is

required to demonstrate. The Florida Beginning Teacher Program evolved from state law and policy; it is district based, culminating in regular certification for successful participants.

Given the direction that the literature indicates in its description and advocacy of similar programs, teachers in the Florida Beginning Teacher Program could experience the support and assistance during their first year that may alleviate some of their concerns and enhance their self-confidence. Ideally, a participant in the Florida Beginning Teacher Program would receive such support from professionals on his support team, who would lend advice and assistance and model the professional attitudes and competencies desirable for a successful teacher as indicated by the Florida Performance Measurement System. Part of the intent of the program is to increase job satisfaction of beginning teachers through setting of support and reinforcement. Participation in the program might influence participants' intent to continue as well as participants' recommendations for re-employment.

A unique feature of the Florida Beginning Teacher Program is the research base that the Coalition extracted from studies on effective teaching and the subsequent organization of findings into a framework and instruments for assessing teacher performance. The Florida Performance Measurement System supplies the framework cited as a need by Borich (1977) and recommended by McDonald and Elias (1980). This study was designed to determine if participants in the Florida Beginning Teacher Program exhibited more specific effective or ineffective behaviors as measured by the FPMS than teachers who had not been given analytical feedback concerning their performance throughout the year.

The question is, "Do inexperienced teachers behave differently during their first year of teaching by participating in the Beginning Teacher Program than inexperienced teachers who do not participate in the Beginning Teacher Program?"

This comparative study of beginning teachers was designed to identify certain differences in attitude, behavior, and competence between teachers who participated in the Florida Beginning Teacher Program in 1982-83 and nonparticipants.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Definitions: Terms generic to this study are defined as follows:

Absentee rate — The rate at which personal sick leave days are used by subjects in the study. This excludes days absent for professional or duty leave.

Beginning Teacher Program — A set of supervised experiences which, having met specified criteria, have been approved by the Department of Education, and which must be successfully completed for teachers with less than three years out-of-state experience to receive initial Florida teaching certification. This program is the independent variable in the study.

Florida Coalition — An organization of Florida School Districts, faculty from public and private Florida universities, and Department of Education staff members who jointly developed and supervised the implementation of the Florida Performance Measurement System.

Florida Generic Teaching Competencies — A set of 24 statements teaching competence which were developed through professional consensus as generic to successful teaching and which have been incorporated as a component of certification requirements, including the Florida Beginning Teacher Program (See Appendix 3 for Competencies.)

Florida Performance Measurement System — Background materials; specified processes; including conferencing, formative and summative evaluation; and instrumentation developed by the Florida Coalition and used for the purpose of verifying the classroom performance of beginning teachers. The system is characterized by the identification of specific teacher behaviors which are supported by the research on effective teaching.

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire — An instrument which gives a score indicative of job satisfaction. This instrument was developed by the Work Adjustment Center at the

University of Minnesota and is based on the theory that job satisfaction is a function of the correspondence between an individual's vocational needs and the reinforcement given in the work setting.

One-full-year Requirement — Candidates for initial certification are required to participate in an approved Beginning Teacher Program for one full year, substantiated by an employment record equivalent to the number of days required for students' attendance, 180 days, plus participation in pre- and post- school staff development experiences. Subjects for this study all met the one-full-year requirement.

Nonparticipant — Teachers who were exempt from participation in the Beginning Teacher Program by virtue of the fact that they made application for initial certification prior to the July 1, 1982, beginning date of the Florida Beginning Teacher Program. For purposes of this study, these subjects had zero years experience.

Participant — Teachers who applied for initial Florida certification on July 1, 1982, or thereafter, and who were required to successfully complete an approved Beginning Teacher Program before receiving regular certification. For the purpose of this study, these teachers had zero years of experience.

Summative Observation Instrument — A teacher observation instrument developed by the Florida Coalition as part of the Florida Performance Measurement System which identifies summative behaviors (19 effective and 17 ineffective) from the domains of effective teaching and which is used to tally individual behaviors observed in appropriate categories.

Summative Training — Eighteen hours of similar training programs which were conducted in the three districts in the study in the use and implementation of the *Summative Observation Instrument.*

Variables

The Independent Variable

The independent variable in the study was the status of participation in an approved Florida Beginning Teacher Program, i.e., subjects either participated or did not participate in their district Beginning Teacher Program. Although participants in the study were drawn from three county programs, each of these programs was approved by a team of Department of Education reviewers as having met the same criteria. A discussion of the components of the Florida Beginning Teacher Program follows.

Support team. The first step in the Beginning Teacher Program required each participant to be assigned a support team consisting of a building level administrator, a peer teacher, and another professional educator.

Professional development plan. A professional development plan was formulated for each participant by the support team. This plan consisted of written objectives which were related to concepts from the domains of effective teaching from the Florida Performance Measurement System, the Florida Generic Teaching Competencies, and other district objectives. These objectives described the areas of professional growth identified for the teacher derived from either classroom observations or from interviews. In addition, the plan was required to identify the method of demonstration of the objectives identified for the plan, i.e., classroom observation, conferences, portfolio materials, or other interactions; the dates of the demonstrations of skills or competencies; and the results, prescriptive activities, or future plans for demonstrated objectives. This plan was filed in the portfolio of the participant and indicated a direction or emphasis for formative observations by team members.

Formative observations. Each support team member was required to make a minimum of one formative observation during the year-long program. These observations were to be based on the professional development plan and were to be implemented through a pre and post-conference setting. The purpose of the pre-conference was to determine the purpose of the observation and to select the most

appropriate setting for the observation. The purpose of the post-conference was to give feedback to the teacher concerning the results of the observation. All formative observations then became documents in the portfolio.

Summative observations. The building level administrator was required to make two summative observations, the first within the first 90 days of the program and the second subsequent to the program's end. In the districts comprising this study, these observations were made using the **Summative Observation Instrument** from the Florida Performance Measurement System. Each summative observation was to be accompanied by a pre- and post- conference. Each summative observation was also entered into the portfolio of the participant.

Professional portfolio. A professional portfolio was maintained for each participant by the building level administrator with documentation of observations and conferences as well as examples of teacher-designed materials. Each participant was required to enter examples of professional materials into his/her portfolio. These examples may have included samples of lesson plans, samples of written communication such as letters to parents, samples of teacher-designed evaluations of student achievement, and samples of corrected student work.

Verification of program completion. Upon completion of the program, the building level administrator had the responsibility to review the portfolio, evaluate the completeness and effectiveness of the participant's participation in the Beginning Teacher Program, verify satisfactory demonstration of the Generic Teaching Competencies, and recommend successful or unsuccessful completion of the program by the participant. This recommendation and the participant's portfolio was then forwarded to the district superintendent who submitted verification of successful or unsuccessful completion to the Department of Education.

Appeal procedure. At the district level, unsuccessful participants receive ten days during which they may appeal to the building level administrator or the district superintendent for reconsideration. At the end of the ten-day period, the reconsidered recommendation is

forwarded to the Department of Education. Further appeal is made at the state level (See Appendix 4 for Appeal Process).

Inservice training. Emphasis in inservice training for the Beginning Teacher Program in the first year of implementation, 1982-83, was placed on the training of building level administrators in the use of the **Summative Observation Instrument** of the FPMS. A state-wide training program was developed for this purpose and was implemented in all three districts participating in this study. Training consisted of eighteen hours of instruction in program and process orientation and conferencing techniques, with the bulk of the training devoted to the identification and practice of observing and coding of concepts listed on the **Summative Observation Instrument**.

The training of beginning teachers in the program was not addressed through a state-wide training program. All district training for the teachers in this study was locally developed and ranged from six to twenty hours. This training covered the topics of program and process orientation and general aspects of the Florida Performance Measurement System. The training of other members of the support team of the beginning teacher was also sporadic within the districts of the study and ranged from six to twenty hours of training in the topics mentioned above.

The degree of interaction between the beginning teacher and members of the support team varied greatly from team to team and district to district; however, in the state survey, beginning teachers identified the peer teacher as the most helpful support team member. Comments from beginning teachers on the state survey indicated that peer teachers were most helpful in giving help concerning the day-to-day operations of the school.

Nonparticipants. Nonparticipants completed a year of traditional first-year teaching with no identified support system or training. They were included in the regular district evaluation program in which the teacher was evaluated a maximum of two or three times using the regular district teacher evaluation form. A state survey of district instruments in the **Final Report of the Teacher Evaluation Project** (Florida Coalition, 1983), summarized them as being primarily subjective ratings of teacher traits, many of which addressed

teacher characteristics which were indirectly related to instruction. Teachers in the Beginning Teacher Program were required to participate in a minimum of five observations and feedback sessions with three different educators.

Both participants and nonparticipants had regular teaching loads and were paid in accordance with the district's salary schedule.

Dependent Variables

The dependent variables included behaviors, attitudes, and professional competency of first-year teachers as measured by:

1. Personal absentee rate
2. Score on a job satisfaction questionnaire
3. Self-rating on confidence level in performing generic teaching skills
4. Statement of intent to remain in the teaching profession
5. Recommendation by principals for continued employment
6. Performance as indicated by the incidence of effective teaching behaviors recorded on the *Summative Observation Instrument*

The data collected were used to investigate the possible effects of participation in an approved Beginning Teacher Program. The variable of teacher behavior was measured by absentee rate. A second measure of teacher behavior was made through the FPMS **Summative Observation Instrument**, which also served as an indicator of competence. Attitudinal differences were measured by scores on the **Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire**, a statement of confidence in performing the generic teaching skills, and a statement of intent to remain in the teaching profession. Professional competence was measured by the numbers of effective teaching behaviors the subjects demonstrated on the **Summative Observation Instrument** in addition to the principals' recommendations for continued employment.

Research Questions

Research questions that were investigated in this study were:

I. Were there behavioral differences between the two groups as measured by their absentee rate?

II. Were there attitudinal differences between the two groups as measured by their scores on a job satisfaction inventory?

III. Were there differences between the two groups in their self-confidence in performing the generic teaching competencies?

IV. Were there differences between the two groups in their intent to remain in the profession?

V. Were there differences between the two groups in reemployability as measured by the principals' recommendation?

VI. Were there differences between the two groups in the number of effective teaching behaviors exhibited on the *Summative Observation Instrument* of the Florida Performance Measurement System?

Subjects were matched on variables of age, race, sex, in-state or out-of-state university, level of degree, level of teaching, (elementary, middle, or high) and subject area taught (academic, fine arts, exceptional child, vocational). The purpose of the matching was to control for as much variance as possible in view of the lack of any pre-test measures, thus strengthening the possibility that any post-test differences could be attributable to the treatment- participation in the Beginning Teacher Program.

Validity

Considering the premise that a valid observation is one that does not contain systematic irrelevant variation, the following threats to validity were considered: validity of treatment implementation and of drawing statistical conclusions.

Validity of Treatment Implementation

The Beginning Teacher Program in the three counties in the study were approved by the Department of Education as having met the same specified criteria. This approval process included rating each individual component of the Beginning Teacher Program by three teams of twelve program evaluators. The training in use of the Summative Observation Instrument was carefully replicated in all counties, including the use of criterion observations conducted during a practice-training session for district trainers. The length of participation for all participants met the same requirement.

Statistical Conclusion Validity

In relation to statistical conclusion validity, it was important to remember that caution should be used in interpreting the results since only a relationship between variables might be expected. This research falls into the causal-comparative category, as opposed to experimental, in that it attempted to look at differences for phenomena already in progress. Although a situation has been created where there are nonequivalent groups, the treatment was not deliberately manipulated by the researcher in any way.

In considering threats to internal validity, the matching of subjects precluded some threats due to maturation and selection. The two groups were matched on variables to which differences might be attributed. However, this matching will not control for differences which might be attributable to ability and preservice training. While selection variability cannot be ruled out entirely, subjects were matched on levels of grade taught and subject taught, lending more homogeneity to pairs of teachers in the study.

Instrumentation

Data collection for each district was the responsibility of the district Beginning Teacher Contact Person. All instruments and directions were given to the district contact, and it was their responsibility to disseminate and collect all responses. The purposes and activities of the study were discussed in meetings with the district contacts and the support and permission of the district superintendent was

secured. Demographic data used to match pairs were submitted by districts. The following instruments were disseminated to participants for their completion:

1. **The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire** — This instrument elicited a raw score indicative of job satisfaction. The Questionnaire uses 100 items with possible responses ranging from "very dissatisfied" to "very satisfied," on a scale of 1 to 5.
2. **A Self-Rating of Confidence Levels of Competency in Generic Teaching Skills** — This gave subjects a choice of three responses: "I lack confidence in this area," "I feel comfortable in this area," and "I feel very secure in this area."
3. **A Statement of Intent to Remain in the Teaching Profession** — Subjects were asked to indicate their intent to remain in the teaching profession, as well as their intent to remain in their present teaching position. Subjects were given four possible responses ranging from "Continue Indefinitely" to "Not Continue."
4. **Recommendation for Reemployment** — Principals of all subjects were requested to complete a form for recommendation for continued employment, giving them a choice of four possible statements ranging from "Recommendation without reservation" to "Not recommended." Reasons were requested for not recommending a subject.
5. **Summative Observation Instrument** — Principals or other administrative personnel trained in the use of the *Summative Observation Instruments* were requested to submit a summative observation of each subject.

The **Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire** had available normative data on teachers which were used to address the reliability of this instrument; the Questionnaire also has a research base for the items it measures. These Questionnaires were scored by the University of Minnesota.

Data Analysis

The data analysis attempted to identify possible differences between the two groups as opposed to establishing cause and effect relationships. Each hypothesis was tested in view of this premise. The data collected included demographic data for each subject, descriptive data concerning aspects of the treatment, and quantitative data in the form of ratings or responses from the instruments used in the study. Tests of statistical significance included t-tests or nonindependent pairs in analysis of the **Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire** and for the **Summative Observation Instrument and Self-Ratings of Confidence Levels.** The intent to remain in the profession, and principals' recommendation for continued employment were analyzed using the Sign Test to determine if the responses indicated relationships between the variables. The. 05 alpha level was selected for the data in this study.

The data were analyzed such that the treatment and potential biases were competing for alternative explanations for the results and so that analysis might discriminate between the two.

Limitations

Three Limitations on the study are noted. First, the study was limited by the sample which might have precluded the representativeness that a larger sample would have provided.

A second limitation concerned the length of the study. A longer study of the subjects might detect other differences between participants and nonparticipants in the Beginning Teacher Program.

A third limitation concerned the subjective nature of some measures of teacher performance used, including the principals' ratings for reemployment and the self-ratings of confidence in performing the Generic Teaching Competencies.

CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

Six null hypotheses were formulated to test for possible differences between the groups of teachers, participants in the Beginning Teacher Program and beginning teachers not participating in the Beginning Teacher Program:

1. There is no difference between participants in the Beginning Teacher Program and nonparticipants in their absentee rate.
2. There is no difference between participants in the Beginning Teacher Program and nonparticipants in their scores on a job satisfaction inventory.
3. There is no difference between participants in the Beginning Teacher Program and nonparticipants in their self-ratings of confidence in performing the Generic Competencies.
4. There is no difference between participants in the Beginning Teacher Program and nonparticipants in their intent to continue in the profession.
5. There is no difference between participants in the Beginning Teacher Program and nonparticipants in their ratings for continued employment.
6. There is no difference between participants in the Beginning Teacher Program and nonparticipants in the numbers of effective teaching behaviors demonstrated.

The t-test for non-independent pairs was used to test significance of all hypotheses, with the exception of the hypotheses concerning the subjects' intent to remain in the teaching profession and the recommendation for reemployment. The Sign test was used to test significance of these two hypotheses.

Description of Research Participants

Three Florida school districts agreed to participate in this study, Lee County, Hillsborough County, and Marion County. Each was asked to compile a list of all teachers with less than one year experience who were employed by the district for the 1982-83 school year. The

districts were also asked to supply descriptive data for the teachers including age, race, sex, grade-level taught, subject taught, level of degree, and university affiliation. Additionally, districts indicated whether or not the teachers were participants in the Beginning Teacher Program. The teachers were then matched by the researcher on these descriptive variables, creating matched pairs of teachers, one of whom was a participant in the Beginning Teacher Program and one of whom was a nonparticipant. This procedure yielded 77 matched pairs of teachers for subjects of this study. Data describing study participants follows.

Age

All of the participants were inexperienced. Seventy-nine percent of them were in their twenties and 16% of them were in their thirties. The remaining 5% were scattered throughout the 40-50 age bracket. The youngest participant was twenty, and the oldest participant was fifty-four. Mean ages for participants and nonparticipants was 26.62 and 26.77 respectively.

Level and Subject Taught

Fifty-five percent of the subjects were elementary and secondary regular education teachers. Teachers of vocational education represented 14% of the sample, and 31% were teachers of exceptional child education. A comparison of the similarities between participants and nonparticipants is given in Appendix 5.

As a point of reference for the composition of the research sample, a state-wide survey of the Florida Beginning Teacher Program was examined. In the state-wide survey of beginning teachers conducted in May of 1983, 689 teachers participating in the Beginning Teacher Program responded. Of these teachers who responded to the state survey, 66% indicated that they were elementary and secondary regular education teachers, and 20% indicated that they were teachers of exceptional child education. Fourteen percent indicated on the state survey that they were teachers of vocational education.

Sixty-nine percent of the respondents to the state survey indicated that they had no experience as compared to 100% of the subjects of

this study who had no experience. All of the teachers in the state survey were participants in the Beginning Teacher Program.

University Affiliation

Of the subjects in this study, 47% received their degrees from universities from within the State of Florida, and 51% received their degrees from out-of-state universities. Two percent were non-degree vocational teachers. (See Appendix 5 for group comparisons).

Again, as a point of reference, the state-wide survey was examined for university affiliation. By comparison, 296 of the 689 teachers who responded to the state survey received their degrees in Florida with approximately 57% receiving degrees from out-of-state universities. Six percent of the teachers who responded to the state survey were vocational teachers without a degree.

Level of Degree

Bachelor's degrees were held by 95% of the teachers in this study, and 3% of the teachers held Master's degrees. Two percent of the teachers were non-degree vocational teachers. (See Appendix 5 for group comparisons.

Sex and Race

Approximately 81% of the teachers in the sample were females, and 84% of the sample were white. Data on sex and race of participants and non-participants are given in Appendix 5.

Research Questions

Research Question I

Are there behavioral differences between the two groups as measured by their absentee rate? Absentee data, excluding absence for professional reasons, were gathered for participants to see if differences existed in the rate of absence between participants in the Beginning Teacher Program and non-participants. The null

hypothesis was tested for significance at p .05 using the t-test for non-independent pairs. The results indicated that the likelihood of chance explaining the difference in absenteeism between the two groups in the study was p . 054 with an obtained t-value of 1.93 and 76 degrees of freedom. These data were not statistically significant at the alpha level set for this study but they appear meaningful. The participants in the Beginning Teacher Program had a mean number of 4.75 days absent with non-participants producing a mean number of 5.97 days absent. There was a mean difference of 1.22 days absent between the two groups with teachers who did not participate in the Beginning Teacher Program being absent more often. The absentee data are presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1
Days Absent
(n = 77 pairs)

Participants	Nonparticipants
x = 4.75	x = 5.97
S.D. = 3.09	S.D. = 4.23
S.E. Mean = .35	S.E. Mean = .48
Difference Between Means = 1.22	
Degrees of Freedom = 76	
T-Ratio for Difference = 1.93	
Probability (2 Tailed Test) = .054	

Research Question II

Are there attitudinal differences between the two groups as measured by their scores on a job satisfaction inventory? The Long Form of the **Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire** was completed by all participants in the study. This Questionnaire consisted of 100 questions which measured satisfaction with aspects of work and the work environment of respondents.

Examples of the items from the Questionnaire follow:

> "On my present job, this is how I feel about the praise I get for doing a good job."
>
> On my present job, this is how I feel about the way my boss trains his/her employees."

Five response alternatives were presented for each item: "Very Dissatisfied," "Dissatisfied," "Neither," "Satisfied," "Very Satisfied." Twenty scales, each of which consisted of five items, described parameters of job satisfaction. The Questionnaires completed by the participants were scored by the Vocational Psychology Center at the University of Minnesota, and general satisfaction scores for all participants were obtained. The null hypothesis was tested for differences between the general satisfaction scores, using the t-test for non-independent pairs. No significant difference was found between the two groups on the general satisfaction scores at the. 05 alpha level with an obtained t-value of. 04 and 64 degrees of freedom. The mean general satisfaction score of Beginning Teacher Program participants was 78.32. Non-participants had a mean general satisfaction score of 78.23 (See Table 2).

Normative data for the **Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire** were collected for elementary school teachers in an urban setting by the University of Minnesota. The general satisfaction scores for both groups of teachers in this study fall at the 35th percentile of the normative data, the low-average range.

TABLE 2
General Satisfaction Scores on the MSQ (n = 65 pairs)

Participants	Nonparticipants
x = 78.32	x = 78.23
S.D. = 13.49	S.D. = 10.05
S.E. Mean = 1.69	S.E. Mean = 1.26
Difference Between Means = .09	
Degrees of Freedom = 64	
T-Ratio for Difference = .04	
Probability (2 Tailed Test) = .964	

Research Question III

Are there differences between the two groups in their self-confidence in performing the Generic Teaching Competencies? Successful demonstration of the Florida Generic Teaching Competencies is a prerequisite for satisfactory completion of the Beginning Teacher Program (See Appendix 3 for Florida Generic Competencies). The Competencies, derived through a process of professional consensus by Florida educators in 1976, are not stated in behavioral terms, and in the counties included in this study, they are demonstrated largely through the Florida Performance Measurement System to which they have been cross-referenced for this purpose. A questionnaire was

completed by all subjects in this study which asked them to choose their level of self-confidence in performing the Generic Competencies. A choice of three answers was possible: "I feel very secure in this area," "I feel comfortable in this area," and "I lack confidence in this area." The questionnaires were scored, giving an overall score in self-confidence for each participant in performing the Generic Competencies. The null hypothesis was tested for differences between the self-confidence ratings of the two groups in the study. No significant difference was found at the. 05 alpha level using the t-test for nonindependent pairs with an obtained t-value of. 76 and 76 degrees of freedom. Teachers in the Beginning Teacher Program had a mean self-confidence score of 95.95. Nonparticipants had a mean self-confidence score of 94. A score of 120 represented a response of "I feel very secure in this area" in performing all of the Generic Competencies (See Table 3).

TABLE 3
Ratings of Self-Confidence in Performing Generic Competencies (n = 77 pairs)

Participants	Nonparticipants
x = 95.95	x = 94
S.D. = 17.46	S.D. = 18.26
S.E. Mean = 2.00	S.E. Mean = 2.10
Difference Between Means = 1.95	
Degrees of Freedom = 76	
T-Ratio for Difference = .76	
Probability (2 Tailed Test) = .55	

Research Question IV

Are there differences in the two groups in their intent to remain in the profession? Participants were asked to indicate their intent to remain in the teaching profession through responding to one of the following questions:

> "I intend to remain in the teaching profession indefinitely."
>
> "I intend to continue in the teaching profession for at least one more year."
>
> "I intend to continue in the teaching profession only if I cannot find another job."
>
> "I do not intend to continue in the teaching profession."

Participants were also asked to respond to a question concerning their intent to remain in their present position. Intent to remain in their present teaching position was indicated through responses to one of the following questions:

> "I intend to continue in my present teaching position indefinitely."
>
> "I intend to continue in my present teaching position for at least one more year."
>
> "I intend to continue in my present teaching position only if I cannot find another position."
>
> "I do not intend to continue in my present teaching position."

For both questions, a nonparametric test, the Sign test, was used to test the null hypothesis for differences at the. 05 alpha level. There was no significant difference between the two groups of teachers in this study in their intent to remain in the teaching profession.

However, using the Sign test to test the null hypothesis for differences between the two groups of teachers in their stated intent to remain in their present teaching positions, a significant difference in intention to remain in their present positions was found at the. 01 level. Responses from teachers in the Beginning Teacher Program indicated they were

significantly less intentioned to remain in the same teaching position than nonparticipants. Table 4 lists the responses to both intention questions.

TABLE 4
Frequencies of Statements of Intention
(n = 77 pairs)

Statement	Participants	Nonparticipants
Remain		
Remain Indefinitely	67	62
Remain One Year	8	12
Remain Only Until Different Employment	1	1
Not Remain	1	2
Remain in Same Position		
Remain Indefinitely	36	46
Remain One Year	20	16
Remain Only Until Position Secured	5	7
Not Remain	16	8

Research Question V

Are there differences between the two groups in reemployability as measured by the principals' recommendation for reemployment? Principals of all participants were asked to give their employment recommendation of teachers in the study through choosing one of the following responses:

> "I recommend this teacher for continued employment with no reservations."
>
> "I recommend this teacher for continued employment with minor reservations."
>
> "I recommend this teacher for continued employment with some reservations."
>
> "I did not recommend this teacher for continued employment."

Using the Sign test to test the null hypothesis for differences between the two groups' recommendations for employment, no significant difference was found at the .05 alpha level. Table 5 lists the responses. Principals were asked to list reasons if teachers were not recommended for reemployment. For the teachers in this study who were not recommended, the reasons stated concerned nonavailability of the position for the next school year. No teacher continued in this study who was not recommended for successful completion in the Begining Teacher Program; however, only one of the original participants fell into that category.

Research Question VI

Are there differences between the two groups in the amount of effective teaching behaviors exhibited on the *Summative Observation Instrument* of the Florida Performance Measurement System? Data on classroom performances were collected from 37 pairs of teachers in the study using the *Summative Observation Instrument* of the FPMS. (See Appendix 2 for example) All teachers who were participants in the Beginning Teacher Program from the counties represented in this study were required to be observed using this instrument; however, one county declined to participate in this

TABLE 5
Frequency of Principals' Recommendations Concerning Reemployment (n = 77 pairs)

Statement of Recommendation	Participants	Nonparticipants
Recommended with No Reservation	63	60
Recommended with Minor Reservations	10	7
Recommended with Some Reservation	3	8
Not Recommended*	1	2

*Note: Positions unavailable was given as the reason for not recommending

aspect of this study, and one county reported incomplete data, yielding data from 37 matched pairs. These data were reported in number of effective and ineffective teaching behaviors recorded in classroom observations of teachers in the study.

The null hypothesis was tested using the t-test for nonindependent pairs to determine if teachers in either group demonstrated more effective teaching behaviors at the .05 level of significance. An obtained t-value of .18 with 36 degrees of freedom led to a conclusion of no significant difference between the two groups. Teachers in the

Beginning Teacher Program had a mean number of effective teaching behaviors observed of 38.62. Teachers who were nonparticipants in the Beginning Teacher Program had a mean number of 37.73 effective teaching behaviors observed. The observations were made by persons who have been trained in the Florida Performance Measurement System. The null hypothesis was also tested using the t-test for nonindependent pairs to determine if teachers in either group demonstrated more ineffective teaching behaviors at the .05 level of significance. Teachers who were in the Beginning Teacher Program demonstrated significantly fewer ineffective teaching behaviors at the .033 level of significance as evidenced by an obtained t-value of 2.19 with 36 degrees of freedom. Teachers in the Beginning Teacher Program had a mean number of 2.95 ineffective behaviors reported in their observations. Nonparticipants had a mean number of 8 ineffective behaviors reported in their observations. Table 6 presents the observation data.

TABLE 6
Teaching Behaviors Observed on the *Summative Observation Instrument* (n = 36 pairs)

Behavior	x	S.D.	S.E. Mean
Effective*			
Participants	38.62	23.98	4.00
Nonparticipants	37.73	19.40	3.23
Ineffective**			
Participants	2.95	5.63	.94
Nonparticipants	8.00	11.67	1.94

*p = .852
**p = .033

CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to compare two groups of inexperienced teachers, one of which participated in the Florida Beginning Teacher Program and one of which did not participate, to see if differences existed between the groups. Three Florida counties, Hillsborough, Lee, and Marion, participated in the study. The subjects of the study were 154 first-year teachers. One-half of the subjects participated in the first year of the Florida Beginning Teacher Program, which was implemented July 1, 1982. The remaining subjects were exempt from participation in the Florida Beginning Teacher Program due to the fact that their application for Florida teaching certification was made prior to the beginning date of the state program. Subjects from both groups were organized into matched pairs for the purpose of ruling out possible variations that might have existed due to variables of age, race, sex, subject and grade level taught, university affiliation, and level of degree. The length of the study was limited to one year, the first year of implementation of the Florida Beginning Teacher Program.

The teachers who participated in the Florida Beginning Teacher Program were required to successfully complete a year-long program consisting of analytical observations and feedback, support, and assistance by a team composed of the teacher's building level administrator, a peer teacher and another professional educator. The Florida Performance Measurement System, a research-based observation system, was used by three counties in this study for formative and summative observations of the teachers. The teachers were required to successfully demonstrate the Florida Generic Teaching Competencies within the framework of the FPMS. Building level administrators were trained in the use of the system.

In addition, the teachers in the Florida Beginning Teacher Program were required to enter examples of professional work in a portfolio.

At the end of the year-long program, teachers who successfully completed the program were recommended for certification by the district superintendent.

Teachers who were exempt from participation due to the fact that they applied for Florida certification prior to the program's beginning date completed a traditional first-year of teaching with no identified support system or training. All of the teachers had regular teaching responsibilities and were paid in accordance with the district's salary schedule. The various measures discussed in this study were made during April, May, and June of 1983, to determine if differences existed between the two groups.

A t-test for nonindependent pairs was used to test the null hypotheses for differences in absentee rate, job satisfaction, reported self-confidence in performing the Generic Competencies, and classroom observations of research-based effective and ineffective teaching behaviors. Sign tests were used to test null hypotheses to see if differences existed in the subjects' intent to remain in the teaching profession and in their same position. The Sign test was also used to see if a significant difference existed in the principals' recommendation for reemployment for either group.

This study was designed as a component of formative evaluation of the Florida Beginning Teacher Program in view of the opportunity to compare first-year teachers in Florida who participated in the program with those who were exempt in the first year of implementation.

Conclusions

Conclusions which may be drawn from this study will be discussed in terms of each of the research questions which were investigated through the formulation of null hypotheses for the purpose of detecting possible differences between the two groups of teachers that were subjects of this study.

Research Question 1

The first research question concerned differences between the two groups in their absentee rate. The 154 teachers who participated in this study were absent for personal reasons or for illness a total of 792 days during their first year of teaching. The fact that no significant

difference was found between the two groups at the .05 alpha level set for these data is tempered by the result that the probability that the observed difference is due to chance is .054. While this difference is not statistically significant at the level set for the study, it does indicate a possible difference between the two groups, with teachers in the Beginning Teacher Program being absent 1.22 fewer days than the nonparticipants.

Reasons for the lower absentee rate were not determined as a part of this study; however, they might be attributed to the high visibility the teacher had as a participant in the Beginning Teacher Program. For example, the beginning teacher was required to have a minimum of five observations with feedback as compared to two or three observations required of the nonparticipant.

Another reason might be attributed to the idea that a successful year of teaching was identified for Beginning Teacher Participants as being critical as a prerequisite to obtaining Florida teaching certification.

Finally, a standard of performance set by the Florida Performance Measurement System might have set higher expectations for participants in the Beginning Teacher Program. Standards were clearly identified in the program and were to be incorporated in the teacher's professional development plan. Meeting these standards might have required a special effort on the teacher's part to be in attendance.

All of these reasons may have played an important part in the increased daily attendance of the group who participated in the Beginning Teacher Program; however, they have been inferred from the experience and the opinion of the researcher and not founded on data gathered in this study.

Research Question II

This question investigated differences between the two groups in job satisfaction. No significant difference was found on this variable between the two groups. Both groups scored at the 35th percentile of national norms for experienced and inexperienced elementary teachers for the **Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire.** This

percentile is considered the low-average range for the MSQ norms. The scores of both groups of teachers in this study could probably be considered an indication that the first year of teaching is not as satisfying as subsequent years, an idea which is reinforced in the literature concerning problems of beginning teachers. The idea of support offered through the Beginning Teacher Program, particularly through the support team did not appear to affect job satisfaction as indicated by the scores on the Questionnaire.

Research Question III

This question investigated possible differences between the two groups in their ratings of self-confidence in performing the Generic Competencies. No significant difference was found on this variable between the two groups. The data on this variable indicated that both groups felt equally self-confident in performing the Generic Competencies in the classroom with both groups having a mean number in the upper quartile of the self-confidence scores for this questionnaire. These data are very subjective, requiring the participant in the study to judge their own skill and also interpret the language of the Competencies. The Competencies are written in high-inference terms and, as such, are subject to high levels of error.

Research Question IV

This question concerned differences between the two groups in reemployability. No significant difference was found in the recommendation for reemployment for either of these groups. Ninety-one percent of all participants in the study were recommended for reemployment with little or no reservations; 7% were recommended for reemployment with some reservation, and 2% were not recommended with the reason being given as nonavailability of position for the next school year. No participant in the Beginning Teacher Program in this study was unsuccessful. Of the teachers recommended with some reservations, 27% were participants in the Beginning Teacher Program and 73% were nonparticipants. However, a total of only eleven teachers fell into this category.

Research Question V

This question concerned the differences between the two groups in their intent to remain in the profession. No significant difference was found between the two groups in their intent to remain in the teaching program. However, when questioned concerning their intent to remain in the same teaching position, Beginning Teacher Program participants indicated they were significantly more likely to change positions. This was significant at the .01 alpha level.

Teachers who were participants in the Beginning Teacher Program had more opportunities for professional interaction with members of the support team. This interaction included the sharing of positions and roles including, in most cases, observation by the beginning teacher of other professionals in their work setting. Such interaction could contribute to their awareness of new areas and mobility within the teaching field.

This awareness of mobility within the teaching profession could be considered an indication of personal ambition to explore the work setting outside of one's immediate responsibility; however, this is presently conjecture on the part of the researcher.

Research Question VI

This question concerned differences between the two groups in classroom performance.

In this study the *Summative Instrument* was used by trained observers during classroom observations lasting approximately 20 minutes. The null hypothesis was tested to detect possible differences between the two groups in the number of effective behaviors recorded during the observations. This test yielded no significant differences in the number of effective behaviors of the two groups. However, when the null hypothesis was tested to detect possible differences between the two groups in the number of ineffective behaviors recorded during the observations, teachers who participated in the Beginning Teacher Program demonstrated significantly fewer ineffective behaviors at the .05 alpha level.

These data indicate that both groups appear to perform in the classroom using a repertoire of teaching behaviors which have been identified by research as being effective. Beginning Teacher Program participants, however, demonstrate significantly fewer ineffective behaviors than nonparticipants. A possible explanation of this might be attributable to the training given to participants in the Beginning Teacher Program. It has been shown in the literature that teacher behaviors such as those on the *Summative Instrument* can be demonstrated and taught in training programs.

Although the *Summative Observation Instrument* is in the process of being normed, preliminary data indicate the ratio of ineffective to effective behaviors observed in this study fell within the average range for data gathered in norming the Florida Performance Measurement System.

Recommendations

Recommendations stem from two observations made concerning the results of this study. First, since these two groups of teachers were alike in that they were young, inexperienced, and involved in their first year of teaching, it could be expected that differences observed between the two groups might be limited and not representative of teacher behavior in general. It is especially interesting to note that both groups were very similar in many of the measures in this study, lending even more evidence to the homogeneity of the two groups.

Second, recommendations should be made in view of the research of the problems first-year teachers experience, realizing that the first year of teaching is a unique experience and attendant with special concerns. In view of these two premises the following recommendations are made:

1. The teachers who participated in this study should be followed if possible in a longitudinal study of the two groups. In view of the considerable literature describing the first year as a unique period somewhat akin to "boot camp," more effects of the BTP

on participants might very well appear in conflicting studies. To draw conclusions about perceptions and feelings about teaching from first-year teachers may be analogous to drawing conclusions about marriage from newlyweds.

2. Absenteeism in the first year of teaching appears to be worthy of consideration for study. The literature supports the premise that teacher absenteeism affects student achievement negatively. Whether or not first-year teachers are absent more or less than experienced teachers, the factors which affect absenteeism of first-year teachers may be appropriate questions for study.
3. Teaching has been described as a profession without many options for advancement, as a "flat" career. Why teachers move to new teaching assignments and what kinds of teachers, in terms of classroom success and experience, seek changes in teaching assignments are questions worthy of investigation.
4. The Florida Performance Measurement System is an example of a system that permits reliable measures of teacher performance due to the following factors:
   a) The observation instruments are composed entirely of research-based items.
   b) The observation instruments have been examined for validity.
   c) The observation instruments have exhibited acceptable coefficients of reliability.

   As the FPMS instrument for this system is normed, and more data are collected concerning its use, aspects of teacher performance for both inexperienced and experienced teachers may be measured more accurately. Studies of teacher performance might suggest diagnostic applications of appraisal data including the criteria for the placement and content for initial training of teachers. Such diagnostic applications are needed in order to develop and improve inservice training programs for teachers, particularly beginning teachers. Summative applications might be used for establishing merit, certifying additional skills, and for employment decisions.

5. The Florida Generic Teaching Competencies should be reviewed and examined for clarity, objective assessment, and research support. Florida statutes require that the Competencies be demonstrated by the beginning teacher; however, the method of determining performance of the Competencies is not addressed. The task of integrating the Competencies with the Florida Performance Measurement System, raises several issues:

   a) Distinctions need to be made between cognitive skills and performance skills.

   b) Competencies which do not permit accurate measurement need to be clarified. An example is the Competency "Demonstrate the ability to comprehend patterns of physical, social, and academic development in students and to counsel students concerning their needs in this area."

   c) Competencies suggested by research but not included should be considered for possible addition.

6. Finally, components of the Florida Beginning Teacher Program need to be reviewed in view of the needs of the beginning teacher. The Program's purpose appears to be two-fold: to verify competence of the beginning teacher and to offer support and assistance to the beginning teacher. The following recommendations concerning the Beginning Teacher Program are made:

   a) In consideration of the first purpose, the process for performance assessment appears to be in place. Principals have received standardized training in a common assessment system. The consistent implementation of the system at the district level needs to be monitored.

   b) The support team component of the Beginning Teacher Program, designed to offer support and assistance to the beginning teacher, needs to be examined. There were no indications on the *Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire* that teachers who participated in the Beginning Teacher Program perceived any more satisfaction in their work than teachers who did not participate. Additionally, the Self-Confidence ratings of the two groups did not vary

significantly. Questions relating to the amount of time spent in support services, the qualifications of support team members, and the focus of activities engaged in by the members of the support team and the beginning teacher need to be considered:

c) Inservice training for beginning teachers and support team members, other than the principal, needs to be addressed. In the first year of implementation of the Florida Beginning Teacher Program, attention was directed toward the training of the principals in the use of the *Summative Observation Instrument*. Other team members need to develop knowledge and skill in identifying and applying professional growth strategies required by the Beginning Teacher Program.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

EXAMPLE:

COMPOSITION, CRITERIA AND SELECTION PROCESS FOR SUPPORT STAFF

This item of the Beginning Teacher Program shall include:

1) Composition of Beginning Teacher Support Staff. "Three (3) or more individuals including a peer teacher, building level administrator and at least one other professional educator, formally assigned to assist the beginning teacher in the first year(s) of employment." (6A-5.75 (1) (d))

2) Criteria for eligibility for the Beginning /Teacher Support Staff. Peer Teacher — "An experienced teacher who holds a valid regular certificate and teaches at the same level, in the same subject area, or the same service area as the beginning teacher. This teacher shall possess the special knowledge and competencies needed to provide adequate support for the development of beginning teachers." (6A-5.75 (1) (g))

3) Evidence of Demonstrated Competencies or Completion of Training by the Support Staff.

   A) All members of the support staff shall satisfactorily complete the inservice training components designed to teach or update the required competencies. A record of training will be kept for eligible members of the support staff by the Teacher Education Center.

   B) The following inservice training components may be given to members of the support staff:

      1. Orientation to the Beginning Teacher Program
      2. Research findings concerning Teacher Effectiveness
      3. Designing the Portfolio Process and Writing the Professional Development Plan

4. Observation and Conferencing Skills
5. Administering the Summative Evaluation Instrument (building administrators)
6. Communication Skills

4) Criteria for other professional staff.

A) Demonstrates expertise in working with teachers.

B) Uses effective communication skills.

C) Participates in staff development and demonstrates interest in improving teaching skills.

D) Desires to work with beginning professionals.

E) Is able to demonstrate effective teaching skills

5) Selection, notification and assembly of the Support Staff.

A) Responsibility for selection of the support staff — It shall be the principal's responsibility in cooperation with the appropriate director to select members of the Support Staff from a list of personnel qualified through training, experience and recommendation.

B) How will the staff be assembled:

1. Organizational meetings — August pre-planning.
2. The team will meet as a team thereafter with a minimum of two meetings per year or as often as the group feels it is necessary.

C) Notification of Support Staff:

1. Members of the Beginning Teacher Unit shall meet as soon as notified of specific roles.
2. The following procedures may be implemented:
   a. A timeline shall be developed for activities during the first 90 days.
   b. The portfolio file shall be developed for the beginning teacher.
   c. An individual Professional Development Plan shall be developed, using the appropriate form and filed in the portfolio.

D) Options for circumstances which require replacement of members of the Support Staff.

It is the intention of the program to train a cadre of personnel who could replace a member of a Support Staff should it become necessary.

APPENDIX 2

SUMMATIVE OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT

SUMMATIVE OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT

DOMAIN	EFFECTIVE INDICATORS		FREQUENCY	FREQUENCY	INEFFECTIVE INDICATORS
3.0 INSTRUCTIONAL ORGANIZATION AND DEVELOPMENT	1. Begins instruction promptly.				Delays.
	2. Handles materials in an orderly manner.				Does not organize or handle materials systematically.
	3. Orients students to classwork/maintains academic focus.				Allows talk/activity unrelated to subject.
	4. Conducts beginning/ending review.				
	5. Questions: academic comprehension/ lesson development:	asks single factual (Dom. 5.0)			Poses multiple questions asked as one, unison response.
		requires analysis/reasons.			Poses non-academic questions/non-academic procedural questions.
	6. Recognizes response/amplifies/gives corrective feedback.				Ignores student or responses/expresses sarcasm, disgust, harshness.
	7. Gives specific academic praise.				Uses general, non-specific praise.
	8. Provides for practice.				Extends discourse, changes topic with no practice.
	9. Gives directions/assigns/checks comprehension of homework, seatwork assignment/gives feedback.				Gives inadequate directions/no homework/no feedback.
	10. Circulates and assists students.				Remains at desk/circulates inadequately.
4.0 PRESENTATION OF SUBJECT MATTER	11. Treats concept — definition/attributes/examples/non-examples.				Gives definition or examples only.
	12. Discusses cause-effect/uses linking words/applies law or principle.				Discusses either cause or effect only/uses no linking word(s).
	13. States and applies academic rule.				Does not state or does not apply academic rule.
	14. Develops criteria and evidence for value judgment.				States value judgment with no criteria or evidence.
5.0 COMMUNICATION VERBAL AND NONVERBAL	15. Emphasizes important points.				
	16. Expresses enthusiasm verbally/challenges students.				
	17.				Uses vague/scrambled discourse.
	18.				Uses loud, grating, high pitched, monotone, inaudible talk.
	19. Uses body behavior that shows interest — smiles, gestures.				Frowns, deadpan or lethargic.
2.0 MGT OF STD CONDUCT	20. Stops misconduct.				Delays desist/doesn't stop misconduct/desists punitively.
	21. Maintains instructional momentum.				Loses momentum — fragments non-academic directions, overdwells.

APPENDIX 3

FLORIDA GENERIC TEACHING COMPETENCIES

1. The ability to orally communicate information on a given subject in a coherent, logical manner.
2. Demonstrate the ability to write in a logical, easily understood style with appropriate grammar and sentence structure.
3. The ability to comprehend and interpret a message after listening.
4. Demonstrate the ability to read, compose, and interpret orally and in writing, professional material.
5. Demonstrate the ability to comprehend and work with fundamental mathematical concepts.
6. The ability to comprehend patterns of physical, social and academic development in students, including exceptional students in the regular classroom, and to counsel the same students concerning their needs in these areas.
7. Diagnose the entry level knowledge and/or skills of students for a given set of instructional objectives using diagnostic lists, teacher observations, and student records.
8. Identify long-range goals for a given subject area.
9. Construct and sequence related short-range objectives for a given subject area.
10. Select, adapt and/or develop materials for a given set of instructional objectives and student learning needs.
11. Select/develop and sequence related learning activities appropriate for a given set of instructional objectives and student learning needs.
12. Establish rapport with students in the classroom by using verbal and/or visual motivational devices.
13. Present directions for carrying out an instructional activity.

14. Construct or assemble a classroom test to measure students' performance according to criteria based upon objectives.
15. Establish a set of classroom routines and procedures for utilization and care of materials.
16. Formulate a standard for student behavior in the classroom.
17. Identify causes of classroom misbehavior and employ a technique(s) for correcting it.
18. Identify and/or develop a system for keeping records of a class and individual student progress.
19. Demonstrate knowledge of alternative schools and communication resources for students who have special needs.
20. Identify and/or demonstrate behaviors which reflect a feeling for the dignity and worth of other people, including those from other ethnic, cultural, linguistic, and economic groups.
21. Demonstrate instructional and social skills which assist students in developing a positive self-concept.
22. Demonstrate instructional and social skills which assist students in interacting constructively with their peers.
23. Demonstrate teaching skills which assist students in developing their own values, attitudes, and beliefs.
24. The ability to recognize and be aware of the instructional needs of exceptional students.

APPENDIX 4
BEGINNING TEACHER PROGRAM
Verification, Reconsideration, and Appeal

Verification of successful or unsuccessful completion of the Beginning Teacher Program shall be delivered to the superintendent, along with the portfolio of the teacher, at the end of the program. Upon review of the portfolio, the superintendent shall notify the Department of Education of all participants who have successfully completed the program. Participants who have not successfully completed the program shall be notified in writing by the superintendent, specifying a 10-day reconsideration period, during which the unsuccessful participant may confer with the building administrator or superintendent concerning the decision. At the end of the reconsideration period, the superintendent shall notify the teacher in writing of the reconsidered decision and shall forward this decision to the Department of Education.

State Appeal Process

"The Commissioner shall, within ninety (90) days of notification of the local decision and in accordance with Section 120.60, Florida Statutes, inform each beginning teacher who did not successfully complete the program that his or her application for a regular certificate has been denied, and that he or she may appeal to the Education Practices Commission under the provision of Section 231.17, Florida Statutes and Rule 6B-11.05, FAC."

"It shall be the burden of the beginning teacher to show that he or she has met the criteria for successful completion. The Education Practices Commission shall issue a final order granting or denying the certificate after an informal hearing before the Division of Adminstrative Hearings."

APPENDIX 5

Group Comparisons of Demographic Data

	Participants		Nonparticipants	
Age				
	x = 26.62		x = 26.77	
	S.D. = 6.55		S.D. = 6.79	
Subject				
	Regular Education	58%	Regular Education	53%
	Exceptional Education	30%	Exceptional Education	31%
	Vocational Education	12%	Vocational Education	16%
Level				
	Elementary	40%	Elementary	43%
	Secondary	60%	Secondary	57%
University Affiliation				
	In-State	43%	In-State	52%
	Out-of-State	54%	Out-of-State	47%
	Nondegreed	3%	Nondegreed	1%
Degree Level				
	Bachelors	94%	Bachelors	98%
	Masters	3%	Masters	1%
	Nondegreed	3%	Nondegreed	1%
Race				
	White	84%	White	84%
	Nonwhite	16%	Nonwhite	16%
Sex				
	Female	81%	Female	81%
	Male	19%	Male	19%

REFERENCES

Andrews, T. (1983). Assessing beginning teacher performance. Unpublished manuscript.

Blackmore, D.S. (1968). Integration of theory and practice in internship. In D.M. McGeoch (Ed.), *Internships in teacher education.* Washington, D. C.: Association for Student Teaching.

Borich, G. (1977). *The appraisal of teaching.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Bradley, H.W., & Eggleston, J.F. (1978). An induction year experiment. *Educational Research, 20,* 89-98.

Brophy, J., & Evertson, C.M. (1974). *Process-product correlations in the Texas teacher effectiveness study: Final report.* Austin, TX: The University of Texas.

Brophy, J. (1979). Teacher behavior and its effects. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 71,* 733-750.

Burden, P. (1983). Implications of teacher career development: New roles for teachers, administrators, and professors. *Action in Teacher Education. 4,* 21-25.

Burden, P. (1979). Teacher perceptions of the characteristics and influences on their personal and professional development. (Doctoral Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1979). *Dissertation Abstracts International,* 40, 10A.

Bush, R.N. (1977). We know how to train teachers: Why not do so? *Journal of Teacher Education. 28,* 5-9.

Capie, W., & Ellett, C.D. (1982). *Issues in the measurement of teacher competencies.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY.

Carlson, K. (1970). *Preparing urban high school teachers.* Paper presented at the annual convention of National Council for the Social Studies, New York, NY. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 182 465)

Chapman R. (1968). Teaching is also learning. *NASSP Bulletin, 52,* 23-37.

Clark, C. (1979). Five faces of research on teaching. *Educational Leadership, 37,* 29-32.

Coates, T., & Thoressen, C. (1978). Teacher anxiety: A review with recommendations. *Review of Educational Research,* Spring, 159-184.

Coker, H., & Medley, D. (1979). *When does common consensus equal common sense?* Paper presented at a workshop of the American Association of School Administrators, Denver, CO.

Coleman, J. (1966). *Equality of Educational Opportunity.* Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.

Conant, J.B. (1963). *The education of American teachers.* New York: McGraw-Hill..

Cuban, L. (1964). The Cardoza peace corps project: Experiment in urban education.*Social Education, 28,* 446-449.

Day, H. (1959). Attitude changes of beginning teachers after initial teaching experience. *Journal of Teacher Education, 10,* 326-328.

Denemark, G. (1967). Preparing tomorrow's teachers. *Theory into Practice, 6,* 252-259.

Di Tosto, E. (1974). *In-service training for the beginning teacher.* Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. SP 008 451)

Dropkin, S., & Taylor M. (1963). Perceived problems of beginning teachers and related factors. *Journal of Teacher Education, 14,* 384-390.

Ellett, C., Capie, W., & Johnson, C.E. (1980). Assessing teacher performance. *Educational Leadership, 38,* (3), 219-220.

Emmer, E.T., Evertson, C., & Anderson, L.M. (1980). Effective classroom management at the beginning of the school year. *Elementary School Journal, 80,* 219-231.

Fenstermacher, G.D. (1980). What needs to be known about what teachers need to know. In Hall, G.E., Hord, S.M., & Brown, G. (Eds.), *Exploring issues in teacher education: Questions for future research* (pp. 35-50). Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Florida Coalition for the Development of a Performance Measurement System (1984). *Domains: Knowledge base of the Florida performance measurement system.* Tallahassee, FL.

Florida Coalition for the Development of a Performance Measurement System (1983). *Final report: Teacher evaluation project.* Tallahassee, FL.

Florida State Board of Education Administrative Rules (1982). Rule 6A-5.75. Tallahassee, FL.

Florida Statutes (1982). Chapter 231.17 as amended. Tallahassee, FL.

Gaede, O.F. (1978): Reality shock: A problem among first-year teachers. *Clearing House, 51,* 405-409.

Gatewood, T.E., & Mills, R.C. (1975). Teacher education's most neglected area: Middle school teacher preparation. *Contemporary Education,* 46, (4), 253-258.

Good, T.L. (1980). Research on teaching. In Hall, G.E., Hord, S.M., & Brown, G. (Eds.), *Exploring issues in teacher education: Questions for future research* (pp. 51-74). Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Good, T.L., & Grouws, D.A. (1979). The Missouri mathematics effectiveness project: An experimental study in fourth-grade classrooms. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 71,* 255-362.

Good, T.L., & Grouws, D.A. (1979). Teacher effectiveness in the elementary school. *Journal of Teacher Education, 30,* 52-64.

Hamachek, D. (1969). Characteristics of good teachers and implications for teacher education. *Phi Delta Kappan, 50,* 341-345.

Hite, H., Garrison, H., & Killian, G. (1966). *Effects of reduced loads and intensive in-service training upon the classroom behavior of beginning elementary school teachers.* Pullman, WA: Washington State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 010 162)

Hunt, D.W. (1968). Teacher induction: An opportunity and a responsibility. *NASSP Bulletin, 52,* 130-136. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 024 621)

Kehl, E. (1977). *The resident teacher program: A pilot evaluation study.* Eugene, OR: University of Oregon.

Klingele, W.E., & Borland, T. (1972). The professional year in teacher education. *The High School Journal,* 309-341.

McDonald, F.J. (1975). *Beginning teacher evaluation study, phase II: Final report.* Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

McDonald, F.J., & Elias, P. (1976). The effects of teaching performance on pupil learning. In *Beginning teacher evaluation study, phase II, volume I.* Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

McDonald, F.J., & Elias, P. (1980). *Study of induction programs for beginning teachers, volume III.* Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

McIntosh, R.G. (1971). The clinical approach to teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 22,* 18-24.

Moss, R.H. (1967). Redefining the internship. *Journal of Teacher Education, 18,* 399-402.

Prince, D. (1976). Graduates analyze teacher corps impact: The teacher corps experience. *Journal of Teacher Education, 26,* 143-144.

Performance-based certification in Georgia (1979). Georgia Department of Education. Atlanta, GA.

Policies and procedures handbook for HB1706 (1981). Oklahoma Department of Education, Oklahoma City, OK.

Rehage, K.J. (1968). Induction: When student becomes teacher. *NASSP Bulletin, 52, 144-155.*

Rivlin, H.N. (1966). A new pattern for urban teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education 17,* 177-184.

Rosenshine, B. (1976). Recent research on teaching behaviors and student achievement. *Journal of Teacher Education, 27,* 61-64.

Rosenshine, B. (1978). *Reviewing research: Different questions, different answers.* Unpublished manuscript, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR.

Rubin, D. (1968). On being inducted: A beginning teacher reflects. *NASSP Bulletin, 52,* 85-89. (ERIC Document Service No. ED 024 621)

Ryan, K. (Ed.) (1970). *Don't smile until Christmas: Accounts of the first year of teaching.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ryan, K. (1979). Toward understanding the problem. In Howey, K., & Bents, R. (Eds.), *Toward meeting the needs of the beginning teacher* (pp. 35-52). Minneapolis, MN: Midwest Teacher Corps Network.

Ryerson, N.E. (1967). *Exploratory study and planning for a fourth-year paid internship program for both elementary and secondary teachers: Final report.* Pella, IA: Central College (ERIC Document Service No. ED 018 013)

Shimer, S. (1973). Integrated professional year program. *Contemporary Education, 44,* 363-371.

Smith, B.O. (1980). On the contents of teacher education. In Hall, G.E., Hord, S.M., & Brown, G. (Eds.), *Exploring issues in teacher education: Questions for future research* (pp. 3-7). Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Soar, R.S. (1973). *Follow-through classroom process measurement and pupil growth (1970-71): Final report.* Gainesville, FL: University of Florida, College of Education.

Soar, R.S., Medley, D., & Coker H. (in press). Teacher evaluation: A critique of currently used methods. Excepted from *Measurement-based evaluation of teacher performance.* New York, NY: Longman Publishers.

Stallings, J., & Kaskowitz, D.H. (1974). *Follow-through classroom observation evaluation 1972-1973.* Menlo Park, CA: Sanford Research Institute.

Stallings, J., & Kaskowitz, D.H. (1975). *A study of follow-through implementation.* Paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Menlo Park, CA.

Stallings, J. (1980). Allocated academic learning time revisited for beyond time on task. *Educational Researcher, 11,* 11-16.

Summary Report (1982). Tallahassee, FL: Department of Education.

Swanson, P.A. (1968). A time to teach--and a time to learn. *NASSP Bulletin, 52,* 74-84. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 024 621)

Wey, H.W. (1951). Difficulties of beginning teachers. *School Review, 28,* (1), 32-57.

Woodring, P. (1957). *New directions in teacher education.* New York: The Fund for the Advancement of Education.

Zeichner, K.M. (1979). *Teacher induction practices in the U. S. and in Great Britain.* Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Reference Notes

1. Hunter, Bill, (March 15, 1984). Administrator, Arizona Department of Education, Personal communication.

2. Vance, Nancy, (March 13, 1984). Administrator, Commonwealth of Virginia, Department of Education, Personal communication.